

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

I'm increasingly dismayed by the 'echo chamber' effect, wherein I hear the same soundbites on every channel. Even now, a true diversity of opinion is difficult to find, and I find that the best news often comes from foreign sources.

Our 'journalists' seem to live in perpetual fear of offending certain groups, and suppress stories that are in the public interest to know. The information content of the news seems to go down all the time. Why should I need an internet connection in order to approach a state of informed consent?

And advertising interests also seem to drag down the quality and relevance of the viewpoints offered. Many stories are reported in the foreign or alternative press that are actively cut from the mainstream press specifically because they could affect advertising budgets. At least now, different outlets have different sets of advertisers to please.

I don't see how allowing fewer owners would improve this systemic rot. Further conglomeration would increase pressure to bow to one set of opinions (be it from advertisers, bosses, or senior colleagues), and reduce the chance that valuable information might accidentally make it through the gauntlet into the hands of the public.

The lack of detailed and informative political coverage during the midterm elections was just the most recent scandal. I've personally had it with 'infotainment', and strongly oppose any action which seems likely to generate more of it.